



## In-trench treatment for Trench 31 and 34

**Dave Bartus** to: Skinnarland, Ron (ECY)

01/18/2012 06:59 PM

Cc: Andrew Boyd, Rick Albright, Adam Baron, Jack Boller

Bcc: "Conaway, Kathy (ECY)", "Biebesheimer, Joannette (ECY)"

Ron:

I was taking a brief look at the SharePoint-posted permit conditions for Trench 31 and 34 this evening, and have identified a very significant show-stopper for EPA. The specific issue is the so-called "in trench treatment," which is a provision under which wastes subject to LDR treatment standards are placed in a disposal unit prior to meeting LDR treatment standards, with treatment being conducted following placement of untreated waste in the disposal unit. In particular, I note the following permit condition:

The Permittees are authorized to treat mixed waste at 218-W-5 (Trenches 31 & 34) via macroencapsulation [40 CFR 268 Table 1 for Hazardous Debris and MACRO in 40 CFR 268.42] to meet LDR requirements of [WAC 173-303-140](#), incorporated by reference, and in accordance with the description in Addendum C.

As I'm sure you are aware, this issue has been discussed numerous times with you and your staff, including written comments provided to Debora Singleton. I expect that you are also aware that this is a significant issue that was examined by NEIC inspectors in March of last year. EPA's consistent written and verbal input to you and your staff has been that the practice of in-trench treatment does not reflect compliance with Ecology's authorized program requirements, which clearly state that waste must satisfy LDR treatment standards prior to placement in a land disposal unit.

I would like to schedule a meeting with you and anyone else that you feel appropriate to resolve this issue. My intention is to provide RCR-format comments on this chapter of the permit, but I feel that it is important to "tee up" this issue as soon as possible, given the issue's lengthy history.

I would like to be true our discussions today to have informal discussions with the Nuclear Waste Program prior to formal written communications at a management level, but given the lengthy history of this issue, and the numerous instances where EPA has clearly stated that this practice is not consistent with Ecology's authorized program, my feeling is that we are very near, if not past, the point where a formal written communication may be warranted. I'm hoping we can reach a documented agreement on how to resolve this issue next week.

Dave